

## **Known Soldiers: the Roll of Honour at the Australian War Memorial<sup>1</sup>**

PETER LONDEY

*Australian National University*

Australia brought home its Unknown Soldier in 1993, but long before that it had its 'known soldiers': the 100,000 names on the Roll of Honour at the Australian War Memorial. The idea for the Roll of Honour seems to have sprung from the head of Charles Bean, Australia's official correspondent and later official historian for the First World War. It was a simple idea — a list of all the dead from the war — which soon turned out to be very complicated. This paper will examine the origins and precursors of the Roll of Honour, and trace the doubts and arguments of the interwar years when questions about the Roll's content, structure and form forced its proponents to analyse more closely its purpose and meaning. It will discuss the abandonment of original intentions in the rush to give the Roll physical form in the 1950s, and the Roll as a living monument, given life by new rituals and arguments. Today the Roll of Honour is seen by many as sacred space, whose boundaries continue to be keenly contested.

In February 1920 a Sydney solicitor, Arthur Dowling, wrote to the secretary of the Department of Defence. He had just received a Roll of Honour certificate to fill out, for his son Max who had died fighting with the 4th Battalion of the AIF at Pozières in July 1916. But Dowling asked to be sent a second form, for he had had another son, Brian, also killed in the war, though not until September 1918. Brian had also originally been a member of the AIF but in England he had obtained his discharge so that he could join the Royal Flying Corps and was now numbered among the missing. In Dowling's words:

his aircraft was last seen near Cambrai on 2nd Sept. 1918 fighting five enemy aeroplanes by itself, not having heard of him since, notwithstanding exhaustive search, the Air Ministry have presumed his death, and is having his estate wound up so far as it concerns it ... There is no question therefore that he is dead ... As he was originally in the AIF I claim that his name should appear on the Roll of Honor for Australia, in the Nation's History.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the confident assertion of the grieving father, it would be over three decades before the Memorial finally decided whether Brian Dowling's name should appear on the Roll of Honour — and then, after all that, the answer would be negative.

### **Vision**

The Australian War Memorial sprang more than anywhere from the mind of Charles Bean, and from very early on it was to include a list of names of the war dead. Where he took this idea from, we do not know. Antecedents for the concept went all the way back to classical Athens, which erected an annual casualty list of citizens who had died fighting for the state.<sup>3</sup> After a long hiatus, lists of names had reappeared on European war memorials, at least by the time of the Boer War. After the First World War, 90 per cent of Australian local memorials included lists of names.<sup>4</sup> Bean's idea was different, and in its execution became unique, by its attempt to list all of a country's war dead in

one place. But even there, the British had had the same idea. In June 1917, Sir Martin Conway, the Slade Professor of Art at Cambridge and Director-General of the proposed National War Museum (later to expand its remit as the Imperial War Museum), proposed that the museum should also be the national war memorial, and that one of its elements should be lists containing the names of 'every individual who fell in battle or died of wounds'.<sup>5</sup>

Further research would be needed to know whether Bean or Conway were aware of each other's ideas. What is clear, though, is that the two ideas developed in quite different directions, driven perhaps by different ideas of what was being commemorated. Conway's idea ultimately never took physical form at all, for the idea that his War Museum could become the nation's war memorial was rejected by the British government.<sup>6</sup> Bean, on the other hand, was successful in having his vision of an Australian war memorial museum accepted, with a list of the dead, a 'Roll of Honour', at its heart.<sup>7</sup>

As far as the Roll of Honour itself was concerned, despite the superficial similarity almost everything about Bean's vision differed from Conway's. First, location: at the heart of his imagined building, Conway had a 'Hall of Honour as rich and beautiful in character as artists can devise'. This was to be the showcase for portraits and statues of 'such eminent individuals as the people as a whole may delight to single out for special honour'. The list of the dead would be in an adjacent 'Memorial Gallery ... devoted to the separate memorials of the Navy and Army by ships, regiments, and contingents'.<sup>8</sup> Such a distinction between the great and the ordinary did not interest Bean. From the earliest formulations of his plans in 1918, his list of war dead was to be ranged around the walls of the great central hall of his memorial, the space which survives, much truncated from its original purposes, as the Hall of Memory in today's Memorial. Bean's was to be a memorial of the AIF, 'the finest monument ever raised to any army ... a far grander and more sacred monument than the one raised to the individual leader of armies — Napoleon — by the French nation at the Invalides in Paris'.<sup>9</sup> The list of the dead would be right at its heart.

The second difference was in context. Conway's dead were to be seen corporately, first and foremost as members of the military units in which they died. In his Memorial Gallery,

the name of every individual who fell in battle or died of wounds should be legibly inscribed on bronze plates, suitably framed, with the arms, badges and honours of each regiment; here also the special mementos of particular units would find place in the neighbourhood of the regimental or other collective material.<sup>10</sup>

Bean, the future author of six volumes of the Official History, was certainly not insensible to the importance of military units in the lives of the soldiers, but he chose to see the dead primarily as citizens rather than soldiers. Bean saw the men of the AIF as a modern day version of the citizen soldiers of ancient Athens.<sup>11</sup> Certainly, his memorial to them would (in his mind's eye) be more civilian and with more classical allusions than Conway's. Instead of Conway's bronze plates, in March 1918, Bean proposed that his central hall should contain a 'frieze' where there 'should be arranged, by their towns and districts in Australia, the photographs and names of all Australians who have fallen in the War', and at some point added the gloss, 'for a memorial for them and a pride for their descendants'.<sup>12</sup>

The classicising tone should be apparent to anybody who has read the Greek orators, or Perikles' Funeral Oration as it appears in Thucydides.<sup>13</sup>

A year later, when serious planning for the Memorial had begun, Bean's plan was essentially the same, but strengthened in its detail. The frieze would run round the Hall in a band between 3 and 7 feet from the floor (between 90 cm and 210 cm). These heights were important, for they ensured the viewer could be close enough to make out the features in a portrait which, Bean calculated — desperately trying to fit 60,000 names into a finite space — would be oval, an inch wide and 1.25 inches high. Beneath the portrait would be name, age, unit, place where wounded or died, and the date of death — a wealth of information, albeit contained in a space of 2 x 1½ inches. Each portrait would be surrounded by an embossed olive wreath, and covered by glass shaded somehow to reduce reflection. All would be arranged by the name of the district in which the men enlisted.<sup>14</sup>

Around the top of the room would be unit flags, and a man's unit would be among the biographical data to be listed with each name. But that was as far as corporate identity went. Bean's dead would be citizens, from particular places. They would resemble Athenians on a 5th century BC casualty list, who would be listed under the name of their civic tribe, a tribal affiliation determined geographically by what part of Attika their family came from.<sup>15</sup> Yet — partly due to epigraphical conventions of the time — the Athenian casualty lists were very spare, and did not give enough information to single a man out from others of the same name. Yet presumably relatives, friends and fellow demesmen knew what man each name signified. For Bean, above all it was important to preserve each man as an individual. Within the limits of what could be done for 60,000 dead, he wanted every one of his dead to survive, where family, friends and fellow townsmen could find them.

Above all, Bean's vision was different from that which informed the return of Unknown Soldiers, to London, Paris and elsewhere. The symbolic Unknown Soldier represented the anonymity of the war dead; an honest way of remembering campaigns in which a third of the dead had no known grave. But Bean, who felt so close to the Australian soldiers, wanted to fight that anonymity with every tool at his disposal. He wanted to create every one of the Australian war dead as a hero, wreathed in olive. No doubt he could imagine survivors gathering around the portrait on the Roll of Honour and telling tales to keep the man's memory alive. He later wrote:

although throughout the war men and women in the services had necessarily been regarded as ciphers in a huge total ... in this Memorial they must above all be impressed on the minds of citizens as individuals, each with his or her own character, feelings, problems and interests.<sup>16</sup>

So much for the vision.

### Execution

The execution would, of course, be more difficult, and in the process much of Bean's conception would be lost. The photographs were first to go, presumably for reasons of practicality and cost. Already regarded with some doubt by the Australian War Museum Committee in 1919, they drop out of later discussions. Ultimately, much of the other biographical information would follow. First names would be replaced by initials, the date and place of death would be left out. What would be kept would be Bean's desire for names placed so that every name would be legible, names listed alphabetically without regard for rank, and without titles or decorations being listed

(Bean felt that the latter went, disproportionately, to staff officers). The list would be a democratic one, reflecting (in Bean's words) 'that these men all made the one equal sacrifice'.<sup>17</sup> It was also always agreed that, unlike the lists of names on many local Australian memorials, this one should include only the dead. In 1928 the New South Wales Branch of the Returned Sailors' and soldiers' Imperial League of Australia (RSSLIA) requested that the list include the names of all those who served with the AIF. Bean's collaborator, John Treloar, the Director of the Memorial and the man chiefly in charge of making the Roll of Honour a reality, was quick to squash the idea. Apart from the practical problems of inscribing a list of over 300,000 names, the Act of Parliament which established the Australian War Memorial prescribed that it was a monument 'to Australians who died, not to those who served'. Moreover, it was act of homage: 'the Memorial is essentially the work of the men who survived and they would be the last to wish to erect a memorial to themselves'.<sup>18</sup>

So much for the points of agreement. Every other area was one of difficulty. In the early 1920s, Treloar was busy managing the Memorial's huge collection and organising the great exhibitions in Melbourne and Sydney. Bean was busy with the Official History. Both were lobbying to achieve a permanent building in Canberra. Compiling the Roll of Honour was a low priority until a flurry of activity in 1927 and 1928, when the Canberra building finally seemed to be on the horizon.<sup>19</sup> This was when the Roll of Honour, such a simple idea in its conception, turned out to be much more complicated. The key person now was John Treloar. Bean continued to offer advice from the sidelines, but Treloar was trying to solve the issues on a day-to-day basis. Generally they were in agreement, or perhaps Treloar bowed to Bean's wishes. When Bean suggested on one point that they enquire about French, British or American precedents, Treloar replied that 'we must be bound by our own precedents, rather than by the precedents of other countries', but nevertheless dutifully went ahead and made enquiries.<sup>20</sup>

The most difficult question was: who to include? In this, Treloar was guided first and foremost by the Act, with its broad and simple formulation: 'There shall be a Memorial of Australians who died in the War.'

At the same time, he wanted to avoid undue legalism and hoped that the decisions taken would 'be in harmony with the spirit of the War Memorial and the wishes of the Australian people'.<sup>21</sup> For Treloar, that meant inclusion. In 1927 he and Bean had compiled a list of categories they thought should be eligible. They included members of all the Australian forces, including home defence forces, and regardless of whether or not the individuals were 'Australian'; Australians who died serving with other allied forces, whether or not they had originally served with Australian forces; merchant seamen who had died on Australian ships or were Australians who died on non-Australian ships; munitions workers; civilians 'killed as a result of war-like acts by the enemy'; those who died of self-inflicted wounds; and those who had died since the war 'as a result of war service'.<sup>22</sup>

The last group — those who had died after hostilities ended — caused the most difficulty. The names could be obtained from the Repatriation Department which had to determine a cause of death for pension purposes. But the number could not be known, and would continue to rise. Treloar thought he might have to allow 2,500, then was shocked to be advised that the Repatriation Department estimated it at 10,000.<sup>23</sup> Eventually, the planning allowed for a First World War Roll of Honour with 80,000 names, with an immediate list to be produced of those who had died up to that point,

and a later supplementary list of those who died afterwards. In March 1928 the Board of the Memorial considered Treloar's proposals, and accepted most.<sup>24</sup> One exception was men who died of self-inflicted wounds or in the course of 'any breach of discipline'. Treloar was inclined to accept that 'their deaths were the results of mental and moral strains due to the conditions of life to which they were subjected', but evidently the Board did not agree.<sup>25</sup>

With the decisions made, the work of compilation could begin. It continued through the 1930s. In 1938, Treloar could still not estimate when it would be completed.<sup>26</sup> Then came another war, and the extension of the Memorial's remit. The Roll of Honour would be arranged (as before) by town; initially the list for each town or district was to include the dead from both wars, but eventually Treloar decided that dividing the whole Roll of Honour into two would be more practical.<sup>27</sup> By the end of 1951, thirty-three years from the end of the First World War, a mountain of work remained. It would still be ten years before the Roll of Honour finally saw the light of day, but it was a series of decisions between 1952 and 1956 which made that possible. They were pragmatic decisions, but at the same time they had the effect of discarding much of Bean and Treloar's original vision. The catalyst was Treloar's death in January 1952. For years Treloar had tried to control every aspect of the Memorial's operations, doing the work of four men in Bean's view, but was overwhelmed by the enormous task of extending the Memorial's collection and exhibitions to include the Second World War. Moreover, Treloar had been private, almost secretive: nobody else knew in any detail his plans for the future. Bean lobbied for the appointment as Treloar's replacement of Arthur Bazley, who had been Acting Director during the Second World War and had been associated with the Memorial since its inception. The Department of the Interior, which made the appointment, preferred Jim McGrath, a Second World War veteran who had worked at the Memorial for less than a year. With the situation at the Memorial close to crisis, leadership passed to a new generation.<sup>28</sup>

The result was the series of decisions which altered forever the nature of the Roll of Honour. First, it was decided to exclude from the inscribed Roll those who died after specified cut-off dates, and relegate them to 'a supplementary list to be inscribed perhaps in book form in the cloisters'.<sup>29</sup> However, this book never eventuated, and there is no public list at the Memorial of those who died after the cut-off dates as a result of war service. The Repatriation Commission continued to send the Memorial the names of those who had died from war-related causes until 1967, when the Memorial discontinued the practice on the grounds that the lists could not be complete. By then the lists included the names of 32,000 who had died as a result of the First World War and 19,000 from the Second World War.<sup>30</sup> Compilation of the Roll was now in the hands of the Memorial's Chief Historical Records Officer, Bruce Harding. In 1954 he argued that the chief obstacle to progress, an obstacle which meant the task would take at least ten more years, was the need to list the names under towns and districts. His suggestion was an alphabetic listing under each state, but a sub-committee, which included both the seventy-five-year-old Bean and Gavin Long, proposed a listing under military unit at the time of death instead, a listing which would provide 'inspiration to citizens and servicemen'.<sup>31</sup> Federal Cabinet approved the change in March 1955, and a fundamental part of Bean's earlier vision was gone.<sup>32</sup> There was now a final flurry of decisions to allow completion of the Roll. A number of groups were accepted, including those who committed suicide, those who died from VD, those who died as a result of drunken brawls, and so on. The only exceptions were a small

number hanged for civilian offences (partly because it turned out they had not seen much if any service in France) and a man shot while deserting to the enemy.<sup>33</sup>

Two much larger groups were also, finally, rejected: merchant seamen, always up to now considered an integral part of the project, and Australians who had served with allied forces. In both cases, collection of the names was haphazard and difficult, and the problem of defining who was 'Australian' loomed large.<sup>34</sup> Both were relegated to a Commemorative Book which, in this case, does exist. It was at this point that Brian Dowling, with whom we began, lost his place on the Memorial's Roll of Honour.

In part these changes represented an ideological shift. It is possible that a postwar generation did not understand or was not interested in Bean's conception of a memorial to citizen soldiers. The Memorial drifted increasingly towards becoming a military museum. Treloar himself proposed adding the three Service Chiefs as *ex officio* members of the Memorial's Board (Bazley had opposed it), and the military members of the Board had a strong hand, for example, in selecting Ray Ewers' heroic statue of an Australian soldier to dominate the Hall of Memory. Against Treloar's wishes, the rewording of the Memorial's founding Act to extend its commemorative function to include the Second World War also had the effect of narrowing its commemorative focus to exclude civilians.<sup>35</sup> This ideological shift helps explain some of the decisions made about the Roll of Honour in the 1950s: differences over the composition and the layout of the Roll reflect wider differences over how war should be remembered and perhaps foreshadow the obsessive intensity of military commemoration in today's Australia.<sup>36</sup> But ideology is only part of the story. The decisions of the 1950s were also those of a new generation of leaders determined to bring to completion a task left over by their predecessors.

### **A Living Institution**

Erection of the Roll began in 1961; there were still many vicissitudes, as the large number of errors meant that the Second World War panels had to be recast. Nor does the story end there. Corrections are still regularly made to Roll of Honour panels and, sadly, names continue to be added. And the issues of eligibility continued to be hotly debated. The question of merchant seamen never quite went away, and in the 1990s it was decided to erect a memorial to them, with a list of names, not in the cloisters but in the grounds of the Memorial. The Memorial's Military History Section had the task of researching a list of names, based partly on all the work which had been done at the Memorial before the 1950s, and partly on other records, such as those of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission.<sup>37</sup> Peacekeepers have been another difficult group. After Captain Peter McCarthy was killed by a landmine in southern Lebanon in 1988, the Memorial decided that peacekeepers generally should be added to the Roll of Honour. Bureaucratic inertia meant that it never happened. Australia's number of peacekeeping deaths is very small, at thirteen (including police), but the boundaries remain important to many people. The Memorial's Council revisited the question in the late 1990s, and decided that only those peacekeepers who died on operations classed by Defence and Veterans' Affairs as 'warlike service' should be included. That left Peter McCarthy off; only three peacekeepers are included.

There are now two supplementary lists: the Commemorative Roll, to include Australians who died in conflicts which would have made them eligible for the Roll of Honour, except that they were serving in allied forces, or as merchant seamen, or in other cognate roles; and recently a Remembrance Book, to include a number of other

categories, including those who died in mine-clearance operations after the Second World War, and the remaining peacekeepers. Thus was Bean's simple original idea, of one uniform list to honour the dead, split and fractured as decisions were made to establish gradations of remembrance.

In 1993, the Memorial decided to add to its 100,000 known soldiers by bringing back one Unknown, taken from a cemetery in France and interred in the Hall of Memory on the 75th anniversary of the end of the First World War. The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier has now become a focal point of commemorative activity, but the Roll of Honour, with its vast sea of names, continues to exercise a fascination over visitors. At the time of the interment of the Unknown Soldier, a new ritual spontaneously sprang up among visitors, who would place an artificial poppy in the crack between the bronze panels of the Roll of Honour, next to the name of a long-dead member of their family. Bean's grand idea, however watered down, continues to exercise a powerful hold on the public's imagination.

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank: Anne-Marie Condé, always willing to share her vast knowledge of the sources for the Memorial's history, for many leads and much advice; the organizers (Martin Crotty and Craig Barrett) of the stimulating and enjoyable conference, 'When the soldiers return', at the University of Queensland in November 2007, for giving me the opportunity to present this paper to a knowledgeable and receptive audience; and Christina Spittel for encouragement and good advice.

<sup>2</sup> A. Dowling to Secretary, Department of Defence, 18 February 1920, AWM: AWM93, 2/5/19C pt 1.

<sup>3</sup> On Athenian antecedents (and possible inspiration), see Peter Londey, 'A possession for ever: Charles Bean, the ancient Greeks, and military commemoration in Australia', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Vol. 53, 3, September 2007, pp. 344–59, esp. pp. 355–57.

<sup>4</sup> K.S. Inglis, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*, 3rd ed., Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2008, p. 172.

<sup>5</sup> Sir Martin Conway to Sir Alfred Mond, 'Memorandum on the Scope of the National War Museum', CAB 24/22 GT 1650, IWM, central archives, file A1/4; quoted in Gaynor Kavanagh, *Museums and the First World War: a Social History*, London: Leicester University Press, 1994, p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> Kavanagh, *Museums and the First World War*, pp. 135–37.

<sup>7</sup> The concept was agreed to by the Australian War Museum Committee (set up by the government in 1917) on 21 July 1919 (see extract of minutes at AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1). On the Committee's formation and membership, see Michael McKernan, *Here is their Spirit: a History of the Australian War Memorial, 1917–1990*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1991, pp. 40–41, 64–65, 78. It was not until 1923 that the government publicly accepted the Committee's recommendation (McKernan, *Here is their Spirit*, p. 78).

<sup>8</sup> Quoted at Kavanagh, *Museums and the First World War*, p. 134.

<sup>9</sup> C.E.W. Bean, 'The Australian war records: an account of the present development overseas and suggestions of course necessary to be taken at the end of the War', March 1918, pp. 30–31, AWM: AWM38, 3DRL6673, item 362.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted at Kavanagh, *Museums and the First World War*, p. 134.

<sup>11</sup> Londey, 'A possession for ever', pp. 345, 353–54.

<sup>12</sup> Bean, 'The Australian war records', p. 31.

<sup>13</sup> Thucydides 2.35–46. On the Memorial's use on its letterhead of a passage from 2.43.2, see Londey, 'A possession for ever', p. 354.

<sup>14</sup> C.E.W. Bean, 'Further memoir, together with appendices, by C.E.W. Bean, Official Historian, Australian Imperial Force, concerning the official records and history of the Australian Imperial Force; and the establishment of a memorial', 16 April 1919, p. 79, AWM: AWM93, 2/5/7.

<sup>15</sup> See, in general, D.W. Bradeen, 'The Athenian casualty lists', *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 19, 1969, pp. 145–59; further references and discussion at Londey, 'A possession for ever', pp. 354–57.

<sup>16</sup> C.E.W. Bean, 'The beginnings of the Australian War Memorial', with annotations by A. Bazley, undated (c. 1959), p. 17b, AWM: AWM38, 3DRL6673, item 619.

<sup>17</sup> Bean to Treloar, 28 February 1928, AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>18</sup> E.J. Dibdin to Director, Australian War Memorial, 27 February 1928; Treloar to Griffiths, 13 March 1928; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>19</sup> See, in general, Michael McKernan, *Here is their Spirit*, pp. 63–119.

<sup>20</sup> Bean to Treloar, 21 June 1927; Treloar to K.T. Thompson (Repatriation Commission), 30 June 1927; Treloar to Bean, 1 July 1927; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>21</sup> J.L. Treloar, 'Hall Of Memory: determination regarding names to be recorded', 17 February 1928, paras. 3(a), (d), AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>22</sup> J.L. Treloar, untitled document, June 1927; cf. Treloar to Bean, 1 April 1927; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>23</sup> Treloar to Bean, 18 June 1927, AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>24</sup> Minutes of AWM Board of Management, 15 March 1928 (with marginal note by Treloar, 10 June 1928), AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>25</sup> J.L. Treloar, 'Hall Of Memory: determination regarding names to be recorded', 17 February 1928, para. 5(d), p. 6; minutes of AWM Board of Management, 15 March 1928; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>26</sup> Report by Treloar to Board of Management, June 1938, quoted at 'Australian War Memorial: Roll of Honour' (response to questions asked by W.A. McLaren, Secretary, Department of the Interior, 10 June 1952), p. 4; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>27</sup> 'Australian War Memorial: Roll of Honour' (response to questions asked by W.A. McLaren, Secretary, Department of the Interior, 10 June 1952), pp. 5–6, AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>28</sup> For all this, see the excellent account at McKernan, *Here is their Spirit*, pp. 199–208.

<sup>29</sup> Minutes of AWM Board of Management, 23 October 1952 (making the decision not to include all those who died afterwards of war-related causes). Eventually it was decided (at a meeting of the Board on 8 November 1955) that the cut-off dates for the two world wars should be those on which the AIF was formally disbanded: 31 March 1921 and 30 June 1947. AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>30</sup> Agenda and minutes of AWM Board of Trustees, 3 April 1967, AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 2.

<sup>31</sup> B. Harding, 'Roll of Honour' (draft), 9 September 1954; B. Harding, 'Roll of Honour: brief notes regarding completion', 23 September 1954; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1. See agenda and minutes of AWM Board of Management, 7 December 1954, AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>32</sup> Cabinet Decision 354, 17 March 1955.

<sup>33</sup> See especially agenda and minutes of AWM Board of Management, 8 November 1955 and 10 December 1956; the three executed soldiers had been hanged in Australia and the United Kingdom ('Particulars of members of AIF 1914–18 war who were hanged for murder and civil offence', March 1957; AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1).

<sup>34</sup> The decision was effectively made by a sub-committee, consisting of Bean, William McLaren (Secretary of the Department of the Interior), and Gavin Long (the Second World War Official Historian), appointed by the Board of Management meeting on 8 November 1955. Once again, Bruce Harding raised many of the difficulties: B. Harding, 'Roll of Honour: considerations affecting the obtaining of names, and eligibility, of persons who were killed or died while serving in other than Australian forces', 17 November 1955. The decision to leave merchant seamen off was made at the Board of Management meeting on 10 December 1956; Bean went along with the decision in order to prevent further delay, but stated that the merchant seamen, to whom many promises had been made, remained on his conscience (Bean to McGrath, 8 February 1956). All documents at AWM: AWM93, 746/1/2 pt 1.

<sup>35</sup> McKernan, *Here is their Spirit*, pp. 217–20, 227–28.

<sup>36</sup> A full discussion of these issues is beyond the scope of this paper, but I hope to return to the subject elsewhere.



<sup>37</sup> I was acting head of the section at the time. The project would not have been possible without the work of a former merchant seaman, Charles Taylor, who had for some time been researching the names of merchant seamen lost in the two world wars.